

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

Immanuel Dubose,
Petitioner

v.

Case No. 1:10-cv-428

Warden, Lebanon Correctional
Institution,
Respondent

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation filed October 12, 2011 (Doc. 11).

Proper notice has been given to the parties under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), including notice that the parties would waive further appeal if they failed to file objections to the Report and Recommendation in a timely manner. See United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). As of the date of this Order, no objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation have been filed.

Having reviewed this matter de novo pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, we find the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation correct.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **ADOPTED**. Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus is **DENIED** with prejudice.

A certificate of appealability will not issue with respect to petitioner's claim for relief alleged in Count One of the petition, which this Court has concluded is waived and thus procedurally barred from review, because under the first prong of the applicable two-part standard enunciated in *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000), "jurists of reason would not find it debatable as to whether this Court is

correct in its procedural ruling.” A certificate of appealability will not issue with respect to the remaining claims in the absence of a substantial showing that petitioner has stated a “viable claim of the denial of a constitutional right” or that the issues presented are “adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 475 (citing *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 & n.4 (1983); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed.R.App.P. 22(b)).

This Court certifies that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) an appeal of this Order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore DENIES petitioner leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 24(a); *Kincade v. Sparkman*, 117 F.3d 949, 952 (6th Cir. 1997).

Date: December 21, 2011

s/Sandra S. Beckwith
Sandra S. Beckwith, Senior Judge
United States District Court